



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1850  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,246	02/20/2001	Kenping Xie	A34032 PCTUS	5262
21003	7590	10/25/2005	EXAMINER	
BAKER & BOTTS 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/763,246

Applicant(s)

XIE ET AL.

Examiner

Hassan Phillips

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6 and 8-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6 and 8-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications received on August 5, 2005.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 12-14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the business category" in the last line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In order to advance prosecution Examiner has interpreted the claim as best understood.

5. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the one existing IP address" in the last line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In order to advance prosecution Examiner has interpreted the claim as best understood.

6. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the one existing domain name" in the last line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In order to advance prosecution Examiner has interpreted the claim as best understood.

7. Claim 14 recites the limitation "the one existing Chinese hierarchy system domain name" in the last line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In order to advance prosecution Examiner has interpreted the claim as best understood.

8. After consideration of the amendments made to claims 2-5, Examiner has withdrawn the rejection of claims 2-5, under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed August 5, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that:

- a) Neither Low nor Kelly disclose "a method for assigning addresses in full digital code, the method comprising using the full digital code address (FDCA), which comprises an online number";
- b) Low does not disclose a method for assigning to an online computer an FDCA comprising "a telephone number of the user's company or home, and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number";
- c) The "conversion" of claims 8-14 is a mapping between two digital addresses rather than simple conversion between a mere indicator and an actual address;

d) Low does not disclose or suggest a category number specified by the country or area, respectively, for uniformly demarcating the business category, let alone the subcategory number following the category number;

e) Kelly neither anticipates nor renders obvious, an encrypted digital number.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion.

10. Regarding items a) and b), as expressed by Examiner in previous actions, Low teaches a method for assigning addresses in full digital code, the method comprising using the FDCA, which comprises an online number, where Low discloses assigning a code to the URI of a WWW server, (col. 11, line 62-col. 12, line 3). In giving the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, Examiner has interpreted the "code" taught by Low to be the FDCA claimed by Applicant. Applicant acknowledges this in the remarks, however believes that the code is not the same as the FDCA because the code is an indicator rather than a full digital address. Examiner submits that as claimed, Applicants definition of a full digital address is "an online number, said online number comprising the digital number of an established network site, which number is specified by the country or area; a telephone number, said telephone number comprising the IDDD code of the country where a computer user is located, the area code of the domestic DDD of the user's area, and the telephone number of the user's company or home; and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number specified by the country or area for uniformly demarcating the business category".

Art Unit: 2151

Since Low teaches that the code being an online number, said online number comprising the digital number of an established network site, (col. 10, lines 28-63, col. 11, line 62 through col. 12, line 3), and a telephone number of the user's company or home, and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number, (col. 7, lines 42-62, col. 10, lines 28-63), Examiner submits the code taught by Low reads on Applicants claimed invention. Furthermore, as indicated in previous actions Examiner admits Low fails to expressly teach the number being specified by the country or area. Nevertheless, the teachings of Kelly make up for such teachings not expressly disclosed in Low. More specifically, Kelly teaches a method for translating a domain name into a network protocol address comprising: a telephone number (the domain name) being specified by a country and an area, (col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 31). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Low to show the digital number, the telephone number, and the category number being specified by the country or the area because this would have provided an effective and efficient means for assigning addresses to online computers located anywhere in the word, Kelly, col. 9, lines 12-34.

11. Regarding item c), the Examiner respectfully submits Applicant's claims fail to expressly teach "conversion" is a mapping between two digital addresses. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, even if Applicant's claims were to suggest "conversion" is a

mapping between two digital addresses, the teachings of Low clearly disclose converting the FDCA to a digital address where Low teaches code being converted to a URI, (col. 10, lines 38-50).

12. Regarding item d), the Examiner respectfully submits, since the claims lacked insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the business category", Examiner interpreted the claims as best understood. In previous actions, Examiner expressed the combination of Low and Kelly provide a means for teaching a category number specified by the country or area, for uniformly demarcating the business category, and a subcategory number following the category number, since Low teaches an online number, said online number comprising the digital number of an established network site, (col. 10, lines 28-63, col. 11, line 62 through col. 12, line 3), and a telephone number of the user's company or home, and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number, (col. 7, lines 42-62, col. 10, lines 28-63), and Kelly teaches a method for translating a domain name into a network protocol address comprising: a telephone number (the domain name) being specified by a country and an area, (col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 31).

13. Regarding item e), Examiner agrees that Kelly discloses encrypting a pin number. Examiner notes however that the claimed invention fails to specify any particular type of number and only mentions, "assigning an encrypted digital number following the online number". Since Kelly teaches encrypting a pin number following an

Art Unit: 2151

online number, (col. 16, lines 20-44), Examiner submits Kelly reads on the claimed invention.

14. Furthermore, the Examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is also the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art. Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterated the need for Applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 1, 6, 8-17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low et al. (hereinafter Low), U.S. Patent 6,243,443, in view of Kelly, U.S. Patent 6,594,254.

17. In considering claim 1, Low teaches a method for assigning a unique full digital code address (FDCA) to an online computer, the method comprising assigning to said computer an FDCA which comprises: an online number, said online number comprising the digital number of an established network site, (col. 10, lines 28-63, col. 11, line 62 through col. 12, line 3); a telephone number of the user's company or home, and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number, (col. 7, lines 42-62, col. 10, lines 28-63).

Although the disclosed method of Low shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: a number being specified by the country or area.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Kelly discloses a method for translating a domain name into a network protocol address comprising: a telephone number (the domain name) being specified by a country and an area, (col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 31).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Low to show the digital number, the telephone number, and the category number being specified by the country or the area. This would have provided an effective and efficient means for assigning addresses to online computers located anywhere in the world, Kelly, col. 9, lines 12-34.

18. In considering claim 6, although the disclosed method of Low shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: assigning dynamic addresses.

Nevertheless, assigning fixed and dynamic addresses was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. Kelly discloses: clients having fixed, and dynamic IP addresses, (col. 7, lines 39-46).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Low to assign dynamic addresses to temporary on-line computers. This would have provided an effective and efficient means assigning addresses to computers when there are more computers than the amount of fixed addresses available.

19. In considering claim 8, the teachings of Low provide a means for accessing an E-mail box by inputting the FDCA into a modem of a computer by dialing a telephone keyboard (col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 4), linking to the FDCA, and converting the FDCA using dedicated software, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

20. In considering claim 9, Low teaches browsing the Internet by inputting the FDCA into a modem of the computer by dialing up a keyboard of a dial-up telephone (col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 4), linking to the FDCA, and converting the FDCA using dedicated software, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

21. In considering claim 10, the teachings of Low provide a means for accessing an E-mail box by inputting the FDCA into a keyboard of the computer, linking to the FDCA, and converting the FDCA using dedicated software, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

22. In considering claim 11, Low teaches browsing the Internet by inputting the FDCA into a keyboard of the computer, linking to the FDCA, and converting the FDCA using dedicated software, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

23. In considering claim 12, Low teaches converting the FDCA using dedicated interpreting software into an IP address, whereby the FDCA corresponds appropriately to the one existing IP address, (col. 10, lines 38-50).

24. In considering claim 13, Low teaches converting the FDCA using dedicated interpreting software into a domain name, whereby the FDCA corresponds appropriately to the one existing domain name, (col. 10, lines 38-50).

25. In considering claim 14, the teachings of Low provide a means for converting the FDCA using dedicated interpreting software into a Chinese hierarchy system domain name, whereby the FDCA corresponds appropriately to the one existing Chinese hierarchy system domain name, (col. 10, lines 38-50).

Art Unit: 2151

26. In considering claim 15, the teachings of Low provide a means for assigning a subcategory number following the category number, (col. 7, lines 42-62, col. 10, lines 38-63).

27. In considering claim 16, although the disclosed method of Low shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: encrypting numbers.

Nevertheless, encrypting numbers was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. Kelly discloses: digital numbers being encrypted depending on the secure nature of a network, (col. 16; lines 20-44).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Low in order to encrypt a digital number following the online number. This would have provided an effective and efficient means for securely validating the online number, Kelly, col. 16, lines 20-24.

28. In considering claim 17, the teachings of Low provide a means for assigning an address to a mailbox, wherein the mail box address comprises a user name digital number and a domain name of a mail server where the mailbox is located, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

***Conclusion***

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/  
10/19/05

  
**ZARNI MAUNG**  
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER